

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION SIX

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

ANA B. HAYDAR,

Defendant and Appellant.

2d Crim. No. B213755  
(Super. Ct. No. NA007270)  
(Los Angeles County)

Ana B. Haydar appeals an order of the trial court denying a motion to vacate her 1991 guilty plea to possession of cocaine. (Health & Saf. Code, § 11350, subd. (a).) Her guilty plea resulted in a two-year sentence to be served concurrently with the sentence in an unrelated case.

On April 4, 2008, Haydar filed a motion to vacate the 1991 plea and resulting judgment, alleging that she did not receive complete advice of the immigration consequences of her guilty plea, and her attorney did not describe or stipulate to a specific document presenting a factual basis for her plea. After written and oral argument on the matter, the trial court denied the motion. The court reasoned that Haydar received adequate warning that immigration consequences, including deportation, denial of re-entry, or denial of citizenship, could follow from her plea. The court also decided that Haydar did not establish that she would not have entered her guilty plea had she known of the unfavorable immigration consequences. (*People v. Superior Court (Zamudio)* (2000) 23 Cal.4th 183, 210.) Finally, the court concluded that Haydar's attorney

sufficiently stipulated to a factual basis for the plea although the attorney did not describe the circumstances of the crime or refer to a specific document discussing the crime.

We appointed counsel to represent Haydar in this appeal. After counsel's examination of the record, she filed an opening brief raising no issues.

On May 20, 2009, we advised Haydar that she had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues that she wished to raise on appeal. We have not received a response from her.

We have reviewed the entire record and are satisfied that Haydar's attorney has fully complied with her responsibilities and that no arguable issue exists. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

The order is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

GILBERT, P.J.

We concur:

YEGAN, J.

COFFEE, J.

John D. Lord, Judge  
Superior Court County of Los Angeles

---

Linn Davis, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.